



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/537,306	06/02/2005	Olivier Brique	90500-000053/US	1701
30593	7590	08/07/2008	EXAMINER	
HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C. P.O. BOX 8910 RESTON, VA 20195			CHEN, SHIN HON	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2131		
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		08/07/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/537,306	BRIQUE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	SHIN-HON CHEN	2131	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 7/18/08.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 02 June 2005 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1.) Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2.) Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3.) Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-6 have been examined.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 7/18/08 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Inoue U.S. Pub. No. 20010020297 (hereinafter Inoue).

5. As per claim 1, Inoue discloses the method of managing the display of event specifications with conditional access, comprising:

sending data forming an electronic program guide to a decoder, this electronic guide serving to display the events which will be broadcast, these data including, for each event, at least one identifier, textual data and a condition block comprising the conditions required for the access to this event (Inoue: [0013]: the EPG includes program information that indicates access conditions associated with the programs),

sending at least one authorization message to a security module associated with the decoder, this message defining access rights to an event (Inoue: [0009]: the contract conditions stored by the apparatus); wherein the access condition contained in the condition block is expressed in the form of an operation described by a request in a structured language (Inoue: figure 7: the comparison of contract condition and condition block are carried out in structured language where conditional statements are applied) and wherein the method furthermore comprises:

sending the condition block to said security module (Inoue: [0009]: the apparatus reads program information that indicates access condition of the program),

extracting said operation from said condition block (Inoue: [0010] lines 10-15: the reading the information about selected program),

providing said operation to a structured language motor of the security module (Inoue: [0010] lines 14-15: the program information reading device provides data to the determining device),

processing said operation in said structured language motor of the security module (Inoue: [0010] lines 14-15: the determining device determines whether the selected program is allowed to be viewed),

comparing the conditions obtained by said processing of the operation the rights contained in the security module (Inoue: [0010] lines 16-17: comparing the read information and contract condition),

returning by the security module a message indicating, according to the comparison of the condition block and the access rights contained in the security module, if the right exists or not for each event in the security module (Inoue: [0010] lines 17-22: display the result), and

displaying the list of event distinguishing for each event, whether the security module has the right or not (Inoue: [0010] lines 17-22).

6. As per claim 3, Inoue discloses the method of claim1. Inoue further discloses wherein an event is encrypted by at least one control word, these control words are transmitted to the decoder in the form of an encrypted control message also comprising the access conditions, this process consisting in transmitting in the condition block all or part of the control message (Inoue: [0048]).

7. As per claim 4, Inoue discloses the method of claim 3. Inoue further discloses wherein the condition block only includes the data relating to the access conditions contained in the control message (Inoue:[0015]: program information includes viewing conditions of the programs).

8. As per claim 5 and 6, Inoue discloses the method of claim 4. Inoue further discloses wherein said data related to the access conditions are sent in encrypted or clear form in the condition block (Inoue: [0048]: the programs and its associated viewing conditions are sent in either clear or encrypted form depending on whether they are conditional access programs).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inoue.

11. As per claim 2, Inoue discloses the method of claim 1. Inoue does not explicitly disclose wherein the request is written in SQL language (Structured Query Language). However, Inoue discloses the process of retrieving contract condition and access conditions for comparison in a content access control system (Inoue: [0009]-[0010]). Although Inoue does not explicitly disclose using SQL language to query the contract conditions stored within the set-top box, one with ordinary skill in the art would adopt various structured language including, but not limited, to SQL for performing data retrieval and comparison based on design choice.

Response to Arguments

12. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-6 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Peterka et al. U.S. Pub. No. 20030200313 discloses digital rights management system for clients with low level security.

Hamakawa U.S. Pub. No. 20020066098 discloses digital broadcast receiver and program retrieval display method.

Cezeaux U.S. Pub. No. 20020184652 discloses replication of configuration information for set-top boxes.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SHIN-HON CHEN whose telephone number is (571)272-3789. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8:30am to 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on (571) 272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2131

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Shin-Hon Chen
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2131

/Shin-Hon Chen/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2131